

tute an abject surrender to blackmailing by this Communist dictator.

Since that time I have pondered the subject, and my conviction has become deeper that what is being done is an indefensible mistake, and in the end will cause great complications and difficulties to our Government, as follows:

First. We shall be yielding to blackmail.

Second. In yielding to the blackmail, we shall be indicating to the people of the world that we lack courage and that we run for cover when the dictator speaks.

Third. In my opinion, we shall add fuel to the condemnations and aspersions that have been made of our people in the "Ugly American."

Fourth. In these days, as we are approaching Memorial Day, which is tomorrow, Tuesday, I cannot see how we can sing the praise of and psalms to the fallen dead who gave their lives for our country while at this time we are abjectly surrendering to the blackmail of the dictator.

It is not becoming to our honor. It is not in the interest of our country. The complications and the losses that will follow in the years to come are, in my opinion, incalculable.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on May 24 I issued a statement to the papers of my State, expressing my views about the Castro proposal to exchange Cuban prisoners for tractors to be furnished from the United States. Today, I would like to make a similar statement on the subject so that it will appear in the RECORD.

I have listened to the arguments which have been made by many Senators against the Castro proposal, and I agree it deserves the fullest consideration and discussion by Members of the Congress. Castro's offer is a form of blackmail, and it shows his callous contempt for human life. And it represents the kind of contempt Castro has for the opinion and feelings of the people of our country.

Nevertheless, I believe the United States has no choice other than to provide means to secure the release of the prisoners approximately 1,200 in number, captured in the ill-fated landing. I say this because it was the final decision of the United States which sent these men into Cuba, and into captivity. Whatever arguments may be made about the deficiencies on intelligence in the CIA, and on the advice of the Department of Defense, it is correct that, finally, the President of the United States decided to give support to the Cubans who landed in Cuba.

If these men were citizens of the United States, we would have other means to secure their liberation, even, if necessary, that of physical force; but we know that our force will not be used to liberate the Cuban prisoners.

The United States bears a special responsibility toward the prisoners. It is a responsibility which arises from the decision of the U.S. Government and of the President of the United States to support the ill-fated landing which resulted in their captivity.

I have not mentioned the moral and humanitarian aspects of the problem. They are important but we are not always able to fulfill every humanitarian appeal. But in this case they have particular significance, because of the responsibility assumed by our Government in the landings.

I make one other point. As I understand, the President has been quoted as saying that he supports as a private citizen the efforts being made by the private committee to secure the release of the Cubans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it seems to me the provision for tax deductions to contributors and of export licenses represent a tacit official approval of tractor-prisoner exchange. In these circumstances I think it would be proper and in harmony with the facts for the President of the United States to say that he officially supports the movement. It would assure our people that the foreign policy of our country is being conducted by the President of the United States.

So I wish to summarize my points: First, I support the proposal because the United States bears some responsibility for the landings, and I am not arguing the merits of the decision made at that time.

Second, I believe the President should say that he supports officially the private venture, for otherwise the impression may be held that our policy, and particularly our action respecting Cuba, are decided by private citizens, rather than the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial of the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 26, 1961, entitled "We Have a Moral Duty Toward the Captive Cubans." I think it is a good and compelling editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WE HAVE A MORAL DUTY TOWARD THE CAPTIVE CUBANS

Those inexorably widening ripples from the abortive Cuban invasion have not ceased to cause us trouble. The complex and mystifying tractor deal is another example.

Fidel Castro played a shrewd card when he sent a delegation of Cubans captured during the invasion to negotiate a deal by which other prisoners would be liberated in exchange for 500 tractors. Typically, Castro specified no particular number or type of prisoners, nor did he make clear what sort of tractors he would accept and for what purpose. He has talked vaguely since of an exchange of civil prisoners and his negotiators seem as much in the dark as to what may eventually come of their mission as we are.

Nevertheless we bear a grave responsibility for the plight of the captured Cubans. We trained them, armed them, disregarded their advice and sent them to almost certain disaster.

In spite of angry cries of blackmail echoing throughout Congress, we have a moral responsibility to do what we can toward saving the lives of people we led into such a mess.

It is this responsibility which seems to have led President Kennedy into further involvements with a most unsavory proposal. The thought of exchanging men's lives for machines is repugnant, but it is the lives which count; not the machines, not the thought that a tinpot dictator is laughing at our dilemma, not even the fact that he is now claiming the tractors as reparations.

#### THE ONLY DECENT WAY

The President apparently has attempted to handle the deal unofficially, by asking reputable citizens to serve as a fund raising committee for the tractor purchase. But it quickly became obvious that the citizens' committee could not act in a legal vacuum. It has to have legal clearance for shipment of the machines. Somebody has to reduce Castro's offhand proposal to practical terms, to arrange who will be rescued and when. Mr. Kennedy, carefully explaining that he was not offering governmental countenance to the venture, nevertheless suggested tax exemptions for donors and further aroused the ire of the men on Capitol Hill.

But cries of blackmail, condemnation of the moral tone of the proposal and defiance of Castro simply do not discharge our obligation to people whom we encouraged in a suicidal venture. We have got to do everything humanly possible to rescue these men alive and President Kennedy is apparently trying an elaborate device by which the American people and not the American Government will pay the ransom.

Cuba so far has been an unqualified disaster to this administration. There is nothing heroic in the mopping up operations that must still be undertaken. But they are necessary and failure to go through with them would only worsen the already bruised image of our competence and human concern that the Cuba episode presented to the world. We have already given Castro a propaganda bonus. The tractor deal is only a further installment. We might yet, if irate Congressmen have their way, repudiate it and shout defiance of our bearded taunter. But if we do this we shall look heartless as well as inept. Unpleasant as it is, the tractors for freedom committee is probably the only decent way to handle a not very decent proposition.

#### FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Sunday, May 28, marked the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the independent Republic of Armenia. This event has been observed by more than one-half million Armenian-Americans throughout our Nation.

It is a matter of history that within 2 years after the auspicious founding of the Republic, Soviet acts of aggression destroyed Armenia's fabric of democratic government.

It is also true that Armenians still long for the resurrection of a free Armenian state.

Therefore, it is appropriate on this occasion to express our sincere hopes and good wishes to our Armenian friends. Truly we hail the cultural and civic achievements of our American-Armenian organizations and look forward in friendship to the rebirth of the independent Republic of Armenia.

of Planning Officials, conservationists and sportsmen. Most of these individuals and organizations are not hostile to advertising per se but they are beginning to realize that outdoor advertising is not a legitimate business. It is selling something that it doesn't own—your field of vision. This was the argument of Howard Gossage, a San Francisco advertising man, carried in Harper's magazine, February 1960, a point of view strongly supported by President Carl W. Buchheister of National Audubon Society in the September-October 1960 issue of Audubon magazine.

The action by Congress in 1958 to provide bonuses to the States for billboard controls states that these are established "to preserve the country's scenic assets." The billboard builders have tried to counter this by saying that their signboards are superior to the scenery. Fear and uncertainty are spread through leaflets, flyers, pamphlets, and newsletters.

Oregon is a classic example of how this technique defeated an attempt to preserve Oregon highways from billboard blight. For a generation civic organizations in Oregon had attempted to push through some form of outdoor advertising regulation. Invariably, the State legislature, heavily in debt to the billboard people for strategic and cutrate sign space during election campaigns, either turned such legislation down, modified it to the point of meaninglessness, or drafted it to conform to advertising wishes.

Unable to seek redress from the legislature, civic groups initiated a petition to bring the matter before the voters on election day. The late Senator Richard Neuberger had predicated that such a referendum would be carried by a vote of 4 to 1, but during the last 2 months of the campaign the billboard firms inundated the State with leaflets that screamed in large black type: "Oregon's \$176 million tourist industry would suffer heavy loss," an argument which tourists will indeed question. The leaflets were supplemented by over 400 key billboards, all similarly distorting the issue. The measure was defeated by a 2-to-1 vote.

Sworn statements later showed that the Highway Protection Committee spent about \$10,000 advocating billboard control; the advertising forces spent \$107,967.50. One ironic touch remains: absentee ballots cast 2 to 3 weeks before the election and before the final confusion induced by the advertisers ran 2 to 1 for billboard regulation. The tourist argument, of course, assumes that tourists and travelers will go hungry and sleepless because there is no billboard to tell them where to eat or sleep.

At this writing, the States of Washington and Pennsylvania are on the verge of passing billboard control legislation before the June 30 deadline. President Kennedy's remarks in his highway message of February 28, urging Congress to extend the bonus provision for another 4 years, acted like a spring breeze to refresh and encourage the conservation and civic groups in their battle for billboard controls. The President even suggested that the bonus be raised another one-half of 1 percent to give the States added incentive.

With such high level help our new highway system may yet be saved from billboard blight, but the fight will not be easy.

#### DEVELOPMENTS AT LINFIELD RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in an age when scientific progress and refinement are becoming more and more the prerogatives of the giant corporation, it is well to remember that some of our greatest achievements have enjoyed humble beginnings. In the community

of McMinnville, in Oregon's lush Willamette Valley, is located the Linfield Research Institute, on the lovely campus of Linfield College. The director of the institute is Dr. Walter Dyke, one of our country's pioneers in radar research during World War II. Recently an Oregon newspaper published an article about Dr. Dyke's latest "New Frontier" scientific endeavor, field emission. According to some observers, the work now being done by Dr. Dyke and his staff may well prove to revolutionize the radiology world. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Oregonian of April 27 entitled "Peaceful McMinnville Possesses 'Bomb'" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### MAKING THE DOLLAR—PEACEFUL McMINNVILLE POSSESSES "BOMB" (By Gerry Pratt)

McMINNVILLE.—Southward from Portland through the full tide of a Willamette spring is McMinnville where the roadside stands have moved aside the last of the Winter Kings for boxes of fresh rhubarb and bedding flats of pansy starts and petunias.

It's a gentle, yet pregnant setting for the small college town that harbors the industrial bomb that is in the making in McMinnville today—the Field Emission Corp. of Dr. Walter Dyke.

Here, in what was 60 days ago a Chevrolet garage, men are laying the strategy for what they believe will be the revolution of the radiology world. Their weapon, a flash X-ray device that when applied to medicine will eliminate blurred X-rays and the "take a deep breath—now hold it," of your thermal X-ray examinations of today.

The corporation's basic device has already proved its capabilities to the Ph. D.'s, and research technicians of centers like the applied physics labs of Johns Hopkins; the Naval Weapons Research Laboratory in Virginia; at DuPont in New Jersey; the Frankfort Armory in Philadelphia, and Sandia Air Corp., in New Mexico, and the list doesn't end there.

#### STORY HAS ONLY BEGUN

According to Sales Manager Dan Browning, the marketing story has only begun to be told. Browning, a B-52 development scientist with a master's degree in mechanical engineering, has a typically cautious engineer's approach to question of potential for the corporation's projects.

But Stan Bennett, the corporation's general manager, said of the first 2 years operation: "Our first year earnings were able to take care of our depreciation and all of our operating expenditures. Our second year we were able to break into profit."

Bennett, with a masters in electrical engineering, and Browning, are examples of the management philosophies Dr. Dyke has put to work in field emission to answer the problems of handling such a highly technical business.

"Whether or not it is good fiscal judgment to make expenditures will depend on technical factors," he explained. Whether it's an investment or just another expense depends on how creative it is. This you can only judge if you understand the technical aspects of the operation. What may look unjustifiable from a fiscal view, may turn out the best investment you ever made if it's technically creative, if it leads to a new product."

The challenge in that philosophy has attracted top technical men to Dyke's project. One executive said: "This is the biggest group of field emission scientists in the United States—right here."

The story of the development of Field Emission Corp. began in the years following World War II, when Dr. Dyke left his radar research work at MIT to take up a professorship in physics at Linfield. Dyke is an alumnus of Linfield, which also taught his father and his mother. The best Linfield could offer the young scientist was less than \$2,500 a year. "But Walt felt he should contribute something to the school," an associate recalled, "so he came anyway."

Dyke taught, and when those he taught were ready he founded Linfield Research Institute at the college and began the basic research into the techniques of field emission, or high-speed X-rays.

After 10 years of basic research, there were 5 aimed at developing a device to put to work the research knowledge, and then in July of 1958, with no manufacturing facility to handle the project, he formed Field Emission, a closely held private corporation.

There was in the beginning a payroll of three. There are 110 today, and the feeling you get at the converted Chevrolet showroom is that this is only the skeleton of what is to come. In its 2 years of production the corporation's payroll has blossomed to between \$450,000 and \$500,000 a year, with products known only by model numbers among the researchers who use them.

There is the 215—a \$9,000 unit for the high-velocity studies necessary for research into space and the effect of meteorite bombardings.

Then there is the 201—a \$24,000 machine used in radiation damage studies of component parts. Its application in researching the effects of outer-space radiation on the mechanisms of space vehicles has been vital.

#### VITAL OUTER SPACE RESEARCH

Third and most recent is the 210, a \$2,400 40-pound portable X-ray with the high-speed properties of field emission. There seems to be countless uses for an X-ray machine that can be carried about like a suitcase and that takes X-ray pictures without the subject so much as slowing down.

And now, under plant security that requires special admission badges for visitors, Field Emission is developing the product its scientists feel will move into the vast market of clinical X-rays. The marketing potentials of this unit when priced competitively with thermal X-ray units are astounding. One engineer, putting it mildly, said: "It's nice to have your market before you have your product."

Dyke speaks guardedly of the marketing potential, though he's proud that what has been done has been done without a single sale in Oregon. "We bring the money in and spend it here," was his way of explaining it.

"Half of our gross income is from research project contracts," he said. "There is more basic research and more development now than we have ever had."

And to men like Browning that research and development means: "We will always have a new product."

And to McMinnville that's going to be even more important than the fresh rhubarb stands.

#### EXCHANGE OF TRACTORS FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on May 23 I spoke briefly on this floor in expressing my opposition to the movement, which is afoot, to proceed by private means, not through a governmental agency, to comply with Castro's proposal that he be sent 500 tractors, in exchange for 1,200 prisoners. I felt that that proposal by Castro had all the earmarks of blackmail, and that the acceptance of the proposal would consti-